## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANTHONY WRIGHT, : CIVIL ACTION

Petitioner,

: No. 15-2161

:

MICHAEL WENEROWICZ, ET AL.,

v.

Respondents.

**ORDER** 

**AND NOW**, this 11<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2016, upon careful and independent consideration of the petition for a writ of habeas corpus and after review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Linda K. Caracappa and Petitioner's Objections thereto, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

- Petitioner's objections as to ground one are SUSTAINED. Petitioner's objections are OVERRULED in all other respects.
- 2. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is GRANTED as to ground one. Petitioner's conviction and sentence for burglary are VACATED. Respondent is directed to RELEASE Petitioner from the custody resulting from the judgment of conviction on the burglary count.
- The Report and Recommendation as to grounds two through six is APPROVED and ADOPTED.
- 4. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DENIED** as to grounds two, three and six.
- 5. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED** as to claims four and five.

- 6. A certificate of appealability **SHALL NOT** issue as to the disposition of grounds two through six, in that Petitioner has not demonstrated that a reasonable jurist would debate the correctness of this ruling. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).
- 7. The Clerk of the Court shall mark this case **CLOSED** for statistical purposes.

**BY THE COURT:** 

/s/ Mitchell S. Goldberg

MITCHELL S. GOLDBERG, J.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I have not addressed whether a certificate of appealability shall issue with respect to the disposition of ground one because "[a] certificate of appealability is not required when a state or its representative or the United States or its representative appeals." Fed. R. App. P. 22(b)(3).